

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF WEST VIRGINIA  
AT BLUEFIELD

DANA MARIE MORRIS,

Petitioner,

v.

CIVIL ACTION NO. 1:19-00431

WARDEN REHERMAN,

Respondent.

**MEMORANDUM OPINION AND ORDER**

By Standing Order, this action was referred to United States Magistrate Judge Dwane L. Tinsley for submission of findings and recommendation regarding disposition pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) (1) (B). Magistrate Judge Tinsley submitted to the court his Findings and Recommendation on September 25, 2019, in which he recommended that the court deny as moot the petitioner's Petition for a Writ of Habeas Corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241 (ECF No. 1) and her Letter-Form Motion to Expedite (ECF No. 2), and remove this case from the court's active docket.

In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b), petitioner was allotted fourteen days and three mailing days in which to file any objections to Magistrate Judge Tinsley's Findings and Recommendation. The failure of any party to file such objections within the time allowed constitutes a waiver of

such party's right to a de novo review by this court. Snyder v. Ridenour, 889 F.2d 1363 (4th Cir. 1989).

Objections to the Proposed Findings and Recommendation were due by October 15, 2019. Neither party filed any objections to the Magistrate Judge's Findings and Recommendation within the requisite time period or the extended time period. Accordingly, the court adopts the Findings and Recommendation of Magistrate Judge Tinsley as follows:

1. Petitioner's petition for writ of habeas corpus under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 is **DENIED AS MOOT**;
2. Petitioner's Letter-Form Motion to Expedite is **DENIED AS MOOT**;
3. This action is **DISMISSED**; and
4. The Clerk is directed to remove this case from the court's active docket.

Additionally, the court has considered whether to grant a certificate of appealability. See 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c). A certificate will not be granted unless there is "a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right." 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c) (2). The standard is satisfied only upon a showing that reasonable jurists would find that any assessment of the constitutional claims by this court is debatable or wrong and that any dispositive procedural ruling is likewise debatable.

Miller-El v. Cockrell, 537 U.S. 322, 336-38 (2003); Slack v.

McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000); Rose v. Lee, 252 F.3d 676, 683-84 (4th Cir. 2001). The court concludes that the governing standard is not satisfied in this instance. Accordingly, the court **DENIES** a certificate of appealability.

The Clerk is further directed to forward a copy of this Memorandum Opinion and Order to counsel of record and unrepresented parties.

**IT IS SO ORDERED** this 21st day of November, 2019.

ENTER:



David A. Faber  
Senior United States District Judge